REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-4 and 11-16 are amended; and claims 17 and 18 are added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants note that original claims 1-15 were mis-numbered, as two instances of claim 12 appeared in the claims as originally submitted. Applicants renumbered the second instance of claim 12 as claim 13 and renumbered original claims 13-15 as claims 14-16 accordingly.

I.   35 U.S.C. § 101

The examiner rejects claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 1-10 to specify that the methods comprise computer implemented steps. Claims 1-10 as amended are methods implemented in a physical form. Thus, Applicants have overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

II.   35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The examiner rejects claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. Regarding claim 1, the examiner believes that,

> Claim 1 recites the limitation of "sub-system" in a "computer system." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It appears that the first interface and the second interface should be related, but there is no positive language showing the first interface and second interface to be related. The preamble mentions term "computer system" which normally means "the configuration that includes all functional components of a computer and its associated hardware," but there is no step of "functional components" in the system. It is also vague on "the proposed handler sub-system." In the body of the claim, term "interface," which normally means "the point at which a connection is made between two elements so that they can work with each other" but no step of "connection" appears in the

interface. It appears that they should be related, but no positive
language showing the relation ship has been shown.
Office Action of March 15, 2005, p. 4 (emphasis in original).

Applicants respectfully traverse in-part the rejection of claim 1. Claim 1 as
amended is as follows:

> 1.   A method of developing a computer software system,
> comprising the computer-implemented steps of:
>> defining a first interface associated with a proposed view
>>> sub-system and with a proposed business logic sub-
>>> system, wherein the proposed view sub-system and
>>> the proposed business logic sub-system interact
>>> only via the first interface;
>> defining a second interface associated with a proposed
>>> handler sub-system and with the proposed business
>>> logic sub-system, wherein the proposed handler
>>> sub-system and the proposed business logic sub-
>>> system interact only via the second interface;
>> wherein the proposed view sub-system, the proposed
>>> business logic sub-system, and the proposed handler
>>> sub-system are all isolated from each other;
>> creating the proposed view sub-system in accord with the
>>> first interface; and
>> creating the proposed handler sub-system in accord with
>>> the second interface.

Regarding the examiner's belief that no positive language shows the first and second
interfaces to be related and that no "connection appears in the interface," applicants have
amended claim 1 to overcome the rejection. Claim 1 as amended now provides that the first
interface is associated with the proposed view sub-system and the proposed business logic
sub-system and that the two sub-systems interact via the first interface. In addition, claim 1
provides that the second interface is associated with the proposed handler sub-system and
the proposed business logic sub-system and that the two sub-systems interact via the second
interface. Thus, claim 1 defines a relationship between all cited components. Accordingly,
Applicants have overcome this portion of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second
paragraph.

Regarding the examiner's belief that the term "sub-system" lacks antecedent basis,
Applicants respectfully point out that antecedent basis does exist for the claimed term. For
each instance that the term "sub-system" appears in claim 1, the term is part of a term that